




Docket No.: 6318-0022-2

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313



RE: Application Serial No.: 09/459,574

Applicants: Gen SASAKI

Filing Date: December 13, 1999

For: IMAGE PROCESSING CIRCUIT OF IMAGE INPUT
DEVICE

Group Art Unit: 2615

Examiner: TRAN, N. T.

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

RECEIVED

FEB 12 2004


Technology Center 2600

ELECTION RESPONSE

Our check in the amount of \$0.00 is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier

Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number

22850

(703) 413-3000 (phone)

(703) 413-2220 (fax)

I:\ATTY\ZS\6318\6318-0022-2\6318-0022 PTO CVR SECOND.DOC

Raymond F. Cardillo, Jr.

Registration No. 40,440



#10
2-13-04
je

DOCKET NO: 6318-0022-2

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF :
GEN SASAKI : EXAMINER: TRAN, N. T.
SERIAL NO: 09/459,574 :
FILED: DECEMBER 13, 1999 : GROUP ART UNIT: 2615
FOR: IMAGE PROCESSING CIRCUIT OF :
IMAGE INPUT DEVICE

ELECTION RESPONSE

RECEIVED

FEB 1 2 2004

Technology Center 2600

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Restriction Requirement in the Official Action mailed January 14, 2004, Applicant elects, with traverse, Species I, corresponding to Figure 4 on which Claims 1-6 are readable for further examination on the merits in the present application.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Restriction Requirement for the following reason.

MPEP § 803 states:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.


The claims of the present invention would appear to be part of an overlapping search area.

Accordingly, Applicant traverses the outstanding Restriction Requirement on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a *serious* burden on the Examiner.

Accordingly, an action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/03)

Raymond F. Cardillo, Jr.
Registration No. 40,440

GJM;RFC:ZSS:dnf
I:\ATTY\ZS\6318\6318-0022-2\6318-0022-2 REST. RESP SECOND.DOC